

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0081559 to *Brown et al.* (“*Brown*”). Applicant respectfully traverses, noting that *Brown* does not disclose every element of Applicant’s claims.

Brown

As noted in Applicant’s previous Response, *Brown* discloses standard memory cards employing conventional magnetic strip storage, instead of contain content addressable memory (¶ [0015]).

Claims 1-9

As *Brown* does not disclose content addressable memory, it certainly cannot disclose content addressable memories having both searchable and nonsearchable fields. Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is patentable over *Brown* for at least the reason that it recites a content addressable memory “having a data structure comprising at least one entry, each entry having at least one searchable field and at least one nonsearchable field, the searchable field storing at least one pre-determined server identifier, the nonsearchable field storing user information associated with a corresponding at least one pre-determined server identifier” Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are thus patentable over *Brown* for at least this same reason.

Claims 10-29

Examiner fails to address Applicant’s points regarding claims 10-29. Simply put, *Brown* discloses a card that is incapable of executing any processing on its own. At most, it can only store data, nothing more. Accordingly, *Brown* does not disclose every element of claim 10, which recites comparing data “in a memory card wallet . . .” (emphasis added). Similarly, *Brown* does not disclose every element of claim 22, which recites that “the memory card wallet determines that there is a match between the received identifier and a pre-determined identifier . . .” (emphasis added). Likewise, *Brown* does not disclose every element of claim 29, which recites

that “the memory card wallet determines that there is match between the first user-selected identifier and a stored entry . . .” (emphasis added).

Similarly, Examiner fails to address Applicant’s point noting that *Brown* does not disclose cards storing instructions – only data. *Brown* thus does not disclose every element of claim 28, which recites “instructions for determining . . .” and “instructions for providing”

The remaining claims depend from at least one of claims 10, 22, 28, or 29, and are thus also patentable for at least these same reasons.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-29 are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number below in order to speed the prosecution of this application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896 referencing Attorney Docket Number **351913-910800**.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

Dated: 7/31/06 By 
Jon Y. Ikegami
Reg. No. 51,115
Attorney for Applicants

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone: (650) 833-2104
Facsimile: (650) 833-2100
jon.ikegami@dlapiper.com